

Application Serial No. 09/921,401  
Reply to Office Action of March 14, 2006

AUG 14 2006 PATENT  
Docket: CU-2612

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated March 14, 2006, the Examiner states that Claims 1-5, 9-20 and 23-36 are pending, Claims 1-5, 9-20 and 23-36 are rejected and Claim 36 is objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, Claim 36 is objected to for depending on itself. Claim 36 has been amended to depend from Claim 35.

Throughout the claims, the word "means" has been replaced with --unit--.  
Claims 28-34 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (US 6,786,655) in view of Nose (US 5,025,395). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

The rejection considers that in Cook's system the main body includes private information inputting means (payment system such as a card reader) to input information (payment cards contains private information of the customer, such as the card amount and credit/debit card number). Further, the rejection considers that Nose discloses inputting the user ID at the work station in order to obtain the private information corresponding the user, and thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the user ID, such as disclosed by Nose and incorporate it into the image printing system of Cook because once the private information is obtained, the user is able to output this data in order to receive the outputted images through the backyard printing.

However, there is an illogical leap in the above mentioned reasoning. Namely, the disclosure in Cook is only that the system is equipped with a card reader in order that the user can pay by his credit card. Generally, the information read by the card reader, such as card number, etc., should be treated as confidential information for use only for payment by the credit card company, and thus, it is hardly considered that the printing system itself owns the card information in order to use it for another purpose such as printing articles receipt confirmation, unless Cook discloses such an embodiment clearly.

Further, the technology disclosed in Nose is related to a multi-desktop system for multi-users on a display unit when sharing a PC or work station with a plurality of users, in order to vary the desktop pattern, such as icons' layout, in accordance with

Application Serial No. 09/921,401  
Reply to Office Action of March 14, 2006

PATENT  
Docket: CU-2612

the individual user by user ID. Namely, the individual displaying conditions are previously set for respective users with correlation to user ID. And, when a user ID is input, the desktop pattern for the user of the input user ID can be displayed in accordance with the previously set condition.

Thus, the input of user ID disclosed in Nose is for the purpose of setting conditions interior to the system (displaying condition), but not for printing a receipt note. Therefore, even if the technology of Nose was applied to Cook, it is far from the construction of the present invention that the input user ID is printed into the receipt note. Further, the print service system of Cook is for the general public, whereas the technology of Nose is for certain particular persons for repeatedly using a PC or workstation. Thus, there is little motivation to combine the technology of Nose to Cook's system.

Thus, the above rejection to independent Claim 1 in view of Cook and Nose is considered overcome.

Further, the kiosk of Cook issues a receipt that has a unique bar code which allows the customer to pay and receive the printed image at a given time.

Although the receipt having a unique bar code of Cook will be used for identifying the customer similar with the receipt and collation sheet according to this invention, the bar code will be automatically decided by the kiosk. Therefore, if the customer loses the receipt, the identification of the customer is difficult. In this invention, since the receipt and the collation sheet have customer identity information which includes the input private information, the identification of the customer is easy even if the receipt is lost.

Therefore, the receipt and collation sheet using the input private information has a clear and advantageous difference over Cook's receipt using a bar code.

Since Claims 2-5 and Claims 35-36 depend from Claim 1, they are also not considered obvious from Cook.

With regard to Claim 9, the rejection insists that the subject matter of this claim is disclosed on the basis of Cook's description that when the images are ready to print, and the customer does not want to have them printed instantaneously, the image is temporarily stored at the kiosk or printed and stored at an area controlled by the cashier, and is identified by a receipt having a unique bar code issued by the kiosk in order to allow the customer to pay and receive the printed images.

Application Serial No. 09/921,401  
Reply to Office Action of March 14, 2006

PATENT  
Docket: CU-2612

However, Claim 9 includes a storage means which stores the printed article therein, and which is locked with and unlocked with certification information input by customer. There is a clear difference between Cook and the invention of Claim 9. Namely, Cook uses the bar code issued by the kiosk, while the invention of Claim 9 uses the certification information input by a customer. Further, since this claim uses the certification information input by a customer, it is possible, without a clerk's help, to open the locked storage means when receiving the printed article. In the amended Claim 9, since the word "means" is amended to "unit", the clerk's operation is clearly excluded. Thus, the subject matter of Claim 9 is not considered as obvious from Cook.

Since Claims 10-19 are dependent on Claim 9, they are also not considered obvious from Cook.

Since Claims 20 and 23-27 are amended so as to depend from Claim 1 or Claim 9, Claims 20 and 23-27 are also not considered obvious from the cited references.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



August 14, 2006

Date

Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613